

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to support a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collections of taxes on income by the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing the Congress of the United States to support a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution by adopting Senate Joint Resolution 29, providing that the several States would have no power to impose and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived except in respect to residents of the State imposing the tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to amend the provisions of Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota, in order to provide for entry of the many thousands, petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog in prior years; and that in order not to create another problem of separated families, those applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to alleviate the burdens presently existing on the textile and fishing industries of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to amend Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to support a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the

imposition and collections of taxes on income by the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps to acquire, establish, and develop a Kettle Moraine National Park in Wisconsin to properly commemorate the glacial age; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1, of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6397. A bill for the relief of Iona Lembesis (nee Rozanitou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6398. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Henryka Bernard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6399. A bill for the relief of Fernando Pereira Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6400. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6401. A bill for the relief of Ingold Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 6402. A bill for the relief of Victor Stiglic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 6403. A bill for the relief of Kim Myon Yon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 6404. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Serpuhi Klavuzoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6405. A bill for the relief of Vukasin Krtolica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 6406. A bill for the relief of Allen S. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

149. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, New Rochelle, N.Y., opposing Federal subsidies for public education on the grounds that they are unnecessary, unreasonable, unsound and dangerous to the preservation of local initiative and vitality; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

150. Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, New Rochelle, N.Y., urging support of House Resolution 161 to eliminate the back-door financing, and requesting Members of the Congress to use their greatest efforts to compel the House Rules Committee to report this measure to the House and then to secure the adoption of same; to the Committee on Rules.

151. Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, New Rochelle, N.Y., urging the repeal of the excise taxes on telephone and transportation services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

152. Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, New Rochelle, N.Y., appealing for the removal of excise tax on luggage, briefcases, personal leather goods such as wallets and key cases, and ladies' handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

153. By Mr. GIAIMO: Petition of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut pertaining to excise taxes on telegraph service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

154. By Mr. KNOX: Petition of residents of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan in behalf of the sovereign state of Finland and its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

155. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Legion for the Survival of Freedom, Inc., McAllen, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defense of American freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Radiation Hazard Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6265, to provide for the vesting of primary responsibility for the protection of the public health and safety from radiation hazards in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.

I believe that this bill deals with a most important and crucial public health hazard, the danger of ionizing radiation. The principal sources of ionizing radiation which have been created or developed by man include X-ray machines, nuclear reactors and their radioisotopic byproducts, high-energy particle accelerators, a number of concentrated forms of naturally occurring radioactive mate-

rials, and the fallout constituents of nuclear weapons. Among these sources, only nuclear reactors, their fuels, their radioisotopic byproducts, and their radioactive wastes have been placed under substantial regulation from the standpoint of their influence on health and safety.

In the absence of a comprehensive program through which the health hazards of all sources of ionizing radiation may be brought under supervision, there is an important weakness in the Nation's efforts to control radiation safely.

X-ray machines are now used extensively in industry as well as in the health professions. Radioisotopes are finding application in a rapidly increasing number of industrial plants, university laboratories, hospitals, and agricultural research centers. And nuclear reactors are being planned and constructed at an accelerating pace. Few areas of human activity remain where sources of ionizing radiation do not find some practical application.

A comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards includes many

elements; two are particularly worthy of attention: (a) The formulation of sound radiation protection standards and (b) the enforcement of public health regulations based upon these standards.

One of the important problems with which the Congress must deal is the extent to which the regulatory and enforcement functions of a radiation control program must be discharged by the Federal Government and to what extent they may be discharged effectively by State and governmental agencies.

Briefly stated, the bill H.R. 6265 would do the following. It declares it to be the policy of this Government that primary responsibility for the protection of the public health from radiation hazards shall be vested in the Public Health Service and in State and local health authorities. It instructs the Surgeon General to develop, in consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards, uniform standards of radiation protection. It authorizes the Surgeon General to conduct research, studies, investigations,

and training programs with respect to the control of radiation hazards both directly and through grants-in-aid. It establishes a National Advisory Council on Radiation Hazard Control, to be appointed by the President and to consist of 15 members, including the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the National Science Foundation. And finally, it requires the Surgeon General to submit to the Congress not later than February 28, 1960, a comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards emanating from all manmade sources. This program will be developed by the Surgeon General after consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6265 was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and it is my hope as chairman of its Subcommittee on Health and Safety that action on this important legislation can still be taken during the first session of this Congress.

Mr. Summerfield's Space Age Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, time was when it took 4 days for regular mail to reach me here from the State of Washington. For 6 years, as a matter of fact, I learned that I could count on this as an immutable rule of thumb.

It was kind of comforting, even, to know I could depend on this, one of the few unchanging constants in an age of bewildering flux.

Alas, no more. Mr. Summerfield, caught up with the spirit of the times, could not leave well enough alone. He persuaded the President and a somewhat reluctant Congress to give him more money through increased postal rates to finance a wholesale modernization program of the postal service. He promised us a new, efficient postal system, in keeping with the moods and needs of the mid-twentieth century.

The new look has arrived, quietly, unheralded.

It now takes 7 days for the mail to reach my office.

I long hesitated to admit, even to myself, that my old familiar 4-day rule had been replaced by a brand spanking new 7-day model. But indisputable proof confronted me last Friday, April 10, when the postman delivered a letter to the office at 1 p.m.

I looked at the postmark. The letter had been posted exactly 7 days earlier, at 1 p.m. April 3, from a small town in the State of Washington.

I felt sad, Mr. Speaker, when the truth was forced upon me. Even this had changed and was no more.

But in the midst of my sorrow, there came the gleam of a comforting thought. Maybe, I said to myself, Mr. Summerfield is wiser than us all. Maybe he alone realizes that in the midst of the noise, and complexity and speed of the space age, we need to be reminded that time is eternal, that life will go on, and that we must preserve some of the old values of cumbersomeness, inefficiency and delay.

World Law—The Bridge Between the Danger and the Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I am scheduled to present this evening before the Wilmington, Del. chapter of the United World Federalists:

WORLD LAW—THE BRIDGE BETWEEN THE DANGER AND THE DREAM

Considering the degree and the immediacy of the danger of a thermonuclear world disaster and the apparent remoteness of peace based on world law, it might be appropriate for me to commence my remarks with the words of a hymn. You are probably acquainted with the second verse of "Turn Back O Man, Forswear Thy Foolish Ways," but let me read it to you:

"Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise,
Age after age their tragic empires rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dreaming weep,
Would man but wake from out his haunted sleep,
Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise."

Hymns, fellowship, prayer—all these should be utilized in the search for world peace. We remember what St. Paul preached. We know that faith needs works. We wonder, are we smart enough to survive? Is it in fact too late to avert world disaster? The cosmic clock may indeed indicate 5 minutes after 12, not before 12.

I didn't come here tonight to despair, nor did I come here to bedazzle you with the prospect of a world at peace, a peace insured by effective world law.

PRESENT POLICIES PUSH ATOMIC WAR CLOSER

I didn't come to make you wring your hands and gnash your teeth and tear your hair, although I grant that these responses may be entirely defensible in the light of our present situation and of our policies which are every day pushing us closer to atomic war and to the destruction of our civilization.

I didn't come to describe for you the social, economic, and cultural configurations of a world no longer forced to dissipate its resources in a gigantic arms race.

I did come to Wilmington from Washington to attempt to delineate more precisely the danger confronting the world today and the dream—the attainment of which means escape from this danger. I came to counsel against excesses of both despair and hope. If we have decided to climb Mt. Everest, we do not give up before we start, nor do we

start without considerable preparations, preparations which might be hastened if that summit were soon to be the only place on earth that could sustain life.

So it is with the attainment of workable world law. I want to discuss several particular preparations we can make and, I add, must make immediately.

Washington, D.C., sometimes described as a place of protocol, alcohol, and Geritol, has no monopoly on attempts to solve this problem, and certainly we can't do it without the help of Wilmington, Del., Eugene, Oreg., and people in cities and countries everywhere.

A human being is a frail thing. He can easily be killed. Most of us are reluctantly reconciled to our own personal mortality, but we are appalled at the thought that our children may not have a chance to grow up because of our progress in the arts of weapon making. We would like to figure out how to save them.

We must accurately assess the danger. Are we too alarmist? Is there a balance of terror on which we can rely? Can't we take comfort in the age-old belief that for every offensive weapon man has invented, man has soon developed an effective defense?

THE LINES GROW LONGER

The danger, unquestionably, is unprecendently great. We have explosives inconceivably more powerful than any we ever imagined possessing. Let me illustrate. If you use a line 2 inches long to represent the explosive force of an 11,000-pound blockbuster chemical bomb, the largest we had in World War II, in order to represent on the same scale a 3-megaton hydrogen bomb—a relatively small thermonuclear device—you would have to draw a line 20 miles long.

Propulsion and guidance systems are improving rapidly. Our experts assured us more than a year ago that we now were at the stage of "nuclear plenty," which means each of three nations has more than twice or three times enough bombs to wipe out all human life. Our military men talk dispassionately about the "overkill" problem.

THREE WAYS OF TRIGGERING WAR

But just because we have them doesn't mean we'll use them, does it? Let's look at the ways an all-out war could be triggered.

First, intentionally. We have, I am told, an increasing number of military men privately advocating preventive war, their reason being that in no other way will we have a chance because of vast Soviet superiority in missiles. Of course, the Soviets are aware of this reasoning. And we realize they may decide to insure that their missiles get the head start.

Second, war could start accidentally. That is, the result of human error. Many fingers are on many triggers and those fingers belong to fallible human beings.

Third, by unauthorized action, as where, without proper authority, a custodian of a weapon decides, for reasons of insanity, venality, idealism or perhaps alcohol, to cause a thermonuclear explosion.

We have laws, customs and mechanical safeguards galore with reference to the use of small arms, but a lot of people get hurt and killed with them every day.

A single atomic explosion in these times of tension would be hard to interpret except as an aggressive act, the precursor of an all-out attack. There would be no wreckage to examine, no witnesses to question, only the necessity to judge instantly whether retaliation was in order. I submit to you that the man who had to make the decision would not be inclined to characterize any mysterious blast as anything but an attack.

Until tensions in the world can be reduced, any accidental or unauthorized explosion is likely to set in motion toward all-out war forces which cannot be stopped.

FANTASTIC SPECULATION

Do I speculate fantastically? I wish I could say I did. Let me read what the Rand Corp. said last July on this subject, this corporation being, as many of you know, in effect the private brains of our Air Force:

"It should be recognized that all-out nuclear war could start in many ways, other than by a premeditated Soviet attack. A local war might become so invested with national interests and prestige that Soviet leaders, if faced with decisive defeat, would choose to counter with an all-out attack. This danger has probably increased because Khrushchev seems less cautious than Stalin, less secure in his grasp of power, yet freer to exercise his diplomacy on a global scale. War might occur because of miscalculation of U.S. intentions; in a period of acute tension, verbal and even military indicators would be difficult to interpret, and the premium on a first strike might well tempt the USSR to launch a pre-emptive attack. War might even begin by accident, triggered by a chance release of weapons, and carried on because both sides were poised in a high state of alert for quick and nearly automatic retaliation. Finally, as just mentioned, we cannot rule out the possibility that the United States, faced with a major Soviet challenge, might sometime be forced to resist militarily, even at the risk of devastation."

Later in the same report, a note of hope, at least as to fallout, was sounded:

"To conclude: Despite many unresolved questions about long-term fallout, it seems to be a sound generalization that long-term radiation problems are a less critical threat to the survival of a population than the central short-term problem, namely, how to protect a substantial fraction of the population from the immediate disaster of a nuclear war."

However, disclosures subsequently indicate that food supplies may be far more critical because of long-term radiation, so perhaps even that vestige of comfort is denied us.

ARE WE SMART ENOUGH TO SURVIVE?

The danger is clear and deadly and immediate, yet the usual reaction, when not entirely due to ignorance, is either an indifferent fatalism or a sappy kind of optimistic incredulity. One attitude is summed up in the words, "Well there's nothing we can do about it," and the other in the words, "Things look tough all right but we'll muddle through again." These attitudes may be entirely adequate from a personal mental hygiene point of view but they are not going to help us survive.

There are many things we can do about this danger and we certainly can't count on muddling through. The question is, Are we smart enough to survive? Are we smart enough to apprehend the danger, to conceive the solution and then to proceed step by step to its fulfillment? I don't know. You don't know. We wonder. We hope. We pray.

What about the dream, the solution, a world under law? It isn't so complex nor is it in itself controversial. We don't have war among the States of our Nation—not any more. We have a Federal system. What is controversial is the feasibility of even trying to attain this sort of system for the world. The usual accusations are that those who want world law are out to weaken our position with respect to the Soviet Union and also that such a system would mean an invasion of our sovereignty with interference in local affairs.

WORLD LAW IS THE SOLUTION FOR OUR WEAPONS CRISIS

Let me now call a few witnesses in support of my proposition that world law is the solution for our weapons crisis.

The President has said so. Last August his Assistant Secretary of State for Interna-

tional Organization Affairs, Francis O. Wilcox, expressed administration policy in these words:

"In this nuclear age, when we are all faced with annihilation, man must continue relentlessly his eternal quest for peace. In this quest I believe that our best hope still lies in the concept of collective security and in taking what steps we can to strengthen the peace machinery of the United Nations."

Sometimes the White House and the Republicans in Congress differ, but apparently not on this point. Consider what Senator STYLES BRIDGES, head of the Republican policy committee, said on the floor of the Senate last July 23:

"But we are confronted today with the awful fact that thermonuclear devices make war a threat of total destruction of the civilized world. We face catastrophe if we allow the world to drift into another world war. We may not be able to escape war in any event, but we have a sacred duty to all mankind to try to find another way out."

"Aside from naked power politics, backed by each nation's armed strength, our only hope lies in developing the power of the community, as presently represented by the United Nations, to deal with the trouble spots that lead to war."

"The United Nations cannot control the actions of the great powers. If they are determined to make war, the United Nations will be powerless to stop them."

"But the great powers drift into war by lining up on opposite sides in the crises that occur in smaller nations. If we give the United Nations power to deal constructively with these events and conditions, we can remove many of the causes which set the great powers against each other, and thereby make world war less likely."

The Senator and I disagree on many issues, but not on this one.

HOW DO WE USE THE WORLD LAW CONCEPT?

What is the program? How do we use the concept of world law to bridge the gap between the danger of war and the dream of peace? The short and general answer is that we educate and discipline ourselves so that our executive and legislative branches proceed to carry out a vigorous public consensus demanding that we proceed to strengthen the United Nations and thus permit general massive disarmament.

The longer and more specific answer has, among others, these lines of action:

1. We must set about at once to consider strengthening the United Nations. Article 109 of the United Nations Charter provides procedures for calling a Charter Review Conference. In 1955 and again in 1957 this Conference was postponed pending more auspicious international circumstances.

The Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference meets this June. It is my hope that the United States at that time will urge the Committee to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their position on charter review.

I want to read to you the text of a resolution to be introduced in the Congress this week by myself and several colleagues:

"Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States of America is to protect the freedom of its citizens; and

"Whereas the United States seeks freedom, peace, and prosperity for the peoples of all nations; and

"Whereas the United States has joined with other nations to pursue these goals through the United Nations; and

"Whereas enforceable law has proven to be indispensable to the attainment of these goals and to the peaceful and just settlement of disputes within all civilized communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be United States policy to seek, through the United Nations, the development of world law to protect the freedom, peace, and just aspirations of all peoples, to provide for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and to permit the elimination of national armaments; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution will be sent to the President of the United States, who is hereby requested to initiate studies at the highest level of the changes which should be made in the Charter of the United Nations or in the charters of other international organizations to further the development of world law for the purposes enumerated in this resolution; and, pursuant to this goal; be it further

"Resolved, That the United States Government should urge the United Nations Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference, when it meets in June 1959, to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct appropriate national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their positions on charter review or revision in order to facilitate fruitful consideration of suitable measures to strengthen the United Nations Charter as an effective legislative, executive, and judicial instrument of world law when a Charter Review Conference is held."

In my opinion the very act of seeking to strengthen the United Nations would lessen tensions among nations today and reduce the likelihood of a war by design or a war triggered by an accidental or unauthorized act.

2. Proposals in the Congress and by the Vice President to increase the power of the World Court should proceed on their own and also as part of United Nations Charter revision studies. Senators HUMPHREY and MORSE, among others, propose to allow the Court to decide whether an issue is domestic or not. The Vice President wants the Court to interpret treaties so as to bind the parties. These would be gigantic steps forward away from war and toward peace.

3. The establishment of a United Nations police force, as urged by both the Congress and the President, could be done by action in the United Nations General Assembly. As presently conceived, it would be only for observation and patrol but if, as has been urged from many quarters, such as organization were used to supervise all armed forces in Berlin, its functions might well, in time, grow into something more formidable and effective.

4. Cessation of atomic testing. It was most encouraging that the Geneva talks were recently resumed. Any kind of an international inspection system would be a significant step forward. A would-be violator would have to consider the impact not only of world opinion, but the opinion of his own people.

5. Massive disarmament as proposed by Sir Philip Noel-Baker and others, on a multilateral basis and with proper safeguards of course, is possible. It is also realistic. The other evening Noel-Baker, the great authority on world disarmament, took violent exception to my using the word "dream" to describe world peace through world law. "The romanticists," he said, "are those persons who believe war can be prevented by an arms race." He went on to point out that no country can defend itself today, no matter how much it spends. You might, for a while, defend an airfield or launching site, but not the people. The cities are vulnerable, naked, defenseless. I agree with him that negotiations on a multilateral arms-limitation agreement, of great scope, ought to be begun without delay and with the utmost determination and intelligence.

6. The informing of public opinion here and elsewhere, as by discussions of the danger, the dream, and the programs by organizations like yours, and also the League of Women Voters, labor unions, churches, and schools. The monumental book "World Peace Through World Law," by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, should be used as the basis for profitable sessions. Unofficial international meetings should be held whenever possible to discuss these matters.

AN INFORMED PUBLIC OPINION

Our Government is based on public opinion. In these times it is more necessary than ever before that this public opinion, which elects our leaders, be informed.

No doubt you can suggest improvements on this program. Please do. I could add my own personal project of establishing a chapter in the United States Congress of the World Parliament Association. It will be called Members of Congress for World Law. I could also mention the personal security plans my able and respected friend, Ralph Lapp, the atomic publicist, has for the safety of himself and his family if they survive the first nuclear blast. They have supplies stored away in a shelter not too far out of Washington. He is neither a fatalist nor a sappy optimist, but most of us are one or both.

THE BALANCE OF TERROR

The other night, when I had the privilege of talking with Philip Noel-Baker, he ended his remarks to our small group by saying he believed that very substantial arms reductions were not only critically necessary but technically feasible in terms of effective inspection procedures.

"On the other hand," he said, "I believe that within 10 years we will all be dead and that the earth will be an incinerated relic."

The man sitting next to him, one of our highest scientific policy advisers for the administration, added without hesitation and with somber sincerity, "I believe so, too."

They may well be right. I refuse to believe that they are. It may indeed be 5 minutes after midnight; but, since we are not able to see this cosmic clock and because we want our children to have a chance to grow up, we have no honorable course but to proceed as though there was still time to save the world from becoming an "incinerated relic."

I started with a hymn and I shall end with the closing verse of "Turn Back O Man."

"Earth shall be fair, and all her people one,
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.

Now, even now, once more from earth to sky

Peals forth in joy man's old undaunted cry:
'Earth shall be fair, and all her folks be one.'

Thank you very much.

Voters Support Eisenhower Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, following the recent Easter recess, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, Mr. BYRNES, joined with me in inviting Republican House Members to

report informally on current sentiment in their home congressional districts on these four topics: First, the fight for a balanced budget; second, the adequacy of our defense program; third, the Berlin crisis and the international situation; and fourth, resistance to spendthrift Federal programs.

The response from our membership was gratifying and enlightening. The replies were carefully examined by Mr. BYRNES and myself and were the subject of a detailed report made to the President this morning at the White House leadership conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint release reporting on our findings by topic and by geographical area:

JOINT RELEASE BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA, HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER, AND HON. JOHN W. BYRNES OF WISCONSIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Reports from Republican House Members, back in Washington after spending the Easter recess in their own districts, indicate overwhelming support for administration policies on several fronts, according to House Republican Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK and JOHN W. BYRNES, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

HALLECK and BYRNES earlier had asked their Republican colleagues to pass along reactions of the folks back home to four current issues.

A survey of replies indicated widespread voter support of efforts by the President and Republicans in Congress to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

By the same token, an overwhelming majority of people back home trust President Eisenhower's judgment on the Nation's defense needs, the returning Congressmen told HALLECK and BYRNES.

The President's firm stand on the Berlin situation is receiving widespread approval, most citizens being convinced that appeasement of the Russians would be a grave mistake, in the opinion of Congressmen answering the Halleck-Byrnes inquiry.

Spendthrift programs got a thumbs-down reaction almost everywhere, the GOP members reported.

Following are some of the typical replies received by HALLECK and BYRNES from their colleagues:

ON A BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

Middle West

"The President's fight has taken solid root to a point where Democrats are visibly stunned by the 'spender' label" (Ohio).

"I found overwhelming support for a balanced budget and resistance to Federal spending programs" (Ohio).

"My constituents are definitely for a balanced budget and express a keen interest in reducing expenditures to the fullest extent possible" (Illinois).

"Republicans, particularly, are encouraged over the President's apparent decision to stand firm and hold expenses in line" (Illinois).

"The people of my district overwhelmingly support the President in his drive for a balanced budget" (Michigan).

"The President's position in favor of a balanced budget is extremely popular" (Indiana).

"The people of my district are insisting on a balanced budget. They fear the inflation tendencies now all too prevalent" (Iowa).

"The people of my district want Congress to match any unbalancing of the Eisenhower budget with tax increases, and a large percentage have told me to vote against any

spending bills which would unbalance the budget unless taxes are provided to cover them" (South Dakota).

Atlantic States

"The residents of my district strongly favor our efforts to curtail spending and balance the budget" (Pennsylvania).

"The people * * * continue to insist on a balanced budget" (Pennsylvania).

"The people are generally for a balanced budget" (New York).

"The fight for a balanced budget is generally supported" (New York).

"Basically, the people are concerned with prices, which is an indirect way of saying they want a balanced budget and stable economy" (New York).

"The President must continue to show that the Republican Party stands for a balanced budget, a budget providing for progress and economy in Government at the same time" (Massachusetts).

"I found repeated expressions in support of keeping Federal expenditures under control" (Maine).

"Moderation in Government spending makes sense to the grassroots voters" (New Jersey).

Pacific States

"I have more than 27,000 signatures of citizens of my area on petitions urging that the Government live within its means" (Washington).

"People are saying more and more that inflation must be stopped" (Washington).

"I have been in receipt of over 7,000 letters asking me to back the administration's stand for a balanced budget with no new general taxes" (Washington).

"The general public is demanding retrenchment in spending which will lead to a reduction in taxes" (California).

"The people of my district are quite vehement that I do everything I can to fight for a balanced budget. They feel very strongly that the President should veto any excessive spending bills" (California).

ON THE ADEQUACY OF OUR DEFENSE PROGRAM

Middle West

"Most people are inclined to rely on the judgment of the President rather than the rantings and walls of some of the self-appointed political experts on the other side of the aisle" (Ohio).

"Republicans and Democrats alike believe that the decision of the President can be trusted" (Ohio).

"They believe our defense program to be wholly adequate" (Illinois).

"My people feel that the President is the best authority in determining our defense program" (Illinois).

"The people have confidence in his (the President's) judgment on defense requirements" (Michigan).

"People are pretty much ready to trust the President's position with respect to our preparations for defense" (Indiana).

"They have confidence in President Eisenhower * * * and have no time for the so-called defense experts in the Congress who seem to have all the answers" (Iowa).

Atlantic States

"I received no complaints in regard to our defense program" (Massachusetts).

"They are satisfied that our defense program is satisfactory because they have confidence in the President" (New Jersey).

"My constituents have faith in the President as a military leader" (Pennsylvania).

"My people do not seem inclined to follow the armchair generals who would ignore his (the President's) military experience" (Pennsylvania).

"They believe that our defense program is adequate" (New York).

"The administration's defense program is generally supported" (New York).

Pacific States

"Most citizens realize the President is better qualified by training, education, and access to all facts than anyone else to say what the Nation's defense needs are and that they stand ready to support his judgment" (Washington).

"The people in general believe our defense program is adequate" (California).

*ON BERLIN AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION**Middle West*

"The firm stand on Berlin received almost unanimous approval" (Ohio).

"They are solidly behind him on the Berlin crisis" (Michigan).

"There is renewed appreciation of Secretary Dulles' policy of firmness toward the Communists and concern lest a possible successor be less firm" (Indiana).

"There was almost unanimous support of the present stand in the Berlin crisis, and constant statements that we should be firm, and under absolutely no circumstances attempt to appease the Communists" (Illinois).

"They like our firm position relative to Berlin" (Illinois).

"The people of my district are not too optimistic about a summit conference unless it is first determined that some progress can be made at a meeting of foreign ministers" (Iowa).

"My people want us to stand up to Russia on all issues" (Kansas).

Atlantic States

"The people appreciate that we must keep a stiff upper lip and meet our responsibilities in the Berlin crisis" (New York).

"Many people seemed to feel that the illness of Mr. Dulles has returned the President to more vigorous leadership and that its effect on the country was excellent" (New York).

"I found great enthusiasm among the voters for the President's recent television speeches. Folks agree with his firm stand on the Berlin crisis and are rallying behind him" (Massachusetts).

"Most people have just become immune to crises" (Massachusetts).

"I found strong support of the President's position and a feeling that this is no time for compromise" (Maine).

"They believe he is doing what is best for the country in relation to Berlin" (New Jersey).

"The confidence of our people in the ability of the Republican Party to meet the Soviet challenge is one of our major assets" (Pennsylvania).

"A recent poll showed 99 percent of the people favoring a strong stand on Berlin. Where criticism exists it is almost always that Ike is not rough enough" (Pennsylvania).

Pacific States

"My people expressed confidence in Secretary Dulles and hope that he will be able to return to his position" (California).

"Since the President's speech concerning our firm stand on Berlin, there has been a feeling of general relaxation in tension and worry and confusion" (Washington).

*ON SPENDTHRIFT FEDERAL PROGRAMS**Middle West*

"For the most part, the people that I talked with are opposed to spendthrift programs. A departure from this is noted only in the top echelon of labor organization" (Ohio).

"Iowa people are definitely opposed to spendthrift Federal programs. They hope the President will exercise his veto power in an attempt to hold things within a proper balance" (Iowa).

"The President should continue to emphasize the point that deficit spending feeds the fire of inflation, which imposes a cruel, unfair

tax on low-income groups which can least afford to pay it" (Michigan).

"In my opinion we have failed to make a definite impression on the minds of the people of the vital need for a balanced budget and a sound economy. The spenders still have glamour and get headlines" (Illinois).

"My constituents are against all welfare spending programs" (Kansas).

Atlantic States

"There is strong resistance to spendthrift Federal programs" (New York).

"The people are tax conscious and understand that if they are going to spend, they can expect to be taxed. It isn't politically helpful to be labeled as a spender" (New York).

"I found repeated expressions in support of keeping Federal expenditures under control" (Maine).

"The people are deeply concerned about excessive Federal spending. They are restive about the heavy tax burden and would like some hope of eventual tax relief" (Pennsylvania).

"The Pennsylvania Dutch, whom I represent, have always opposed Federal welfare programs. In my recent chats with them I did not discover that they have changed their viewpoint in any particular" (Pennsylvania).

Pacific States

"The general public is demanding retrenchment in spending which will lead to a reduction in taxes" (California).

"I feel we need to dramatize more of our issues because factual talk about balanced budgets, and inflation, and fiscal responsibility doesn't have the emotional appeal of the 'doing something for somebody' programs" (Washington).

"My mail indicates the public generally is for curtailing new and costly programs" (Washington).

Chamber of Commerce Week**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the current week is known as Chamber of Commerce Week. Evidence that there is nothing new under the sun keeps turning up in the most unlikely places. From far off Mesopotamia comes proof that the local chamber of commerce—that symbol of jet-age enterprise—actually had its counterpart in the ancient city of Mari some 6,000 years ago.

If archeologists who plied their trade amid those ruins have read their cuneiform tablets correctly, the administrative palace of the Kingdom of Mari boasted both a foreign office and a board of trade, and from all accounts, business was really booming. In his book, "The Bible as History," Warner Keller tells us, "More than 100 officials were involved in dealing with the incoming and outgoing messages, which amounted to thousands of tablets."

Babylon had its chambers of commerce, too, apparently within the shadow of the Tower of Babel and the fabulous Hanging Gardens. During the Middle Ages, fairs and merchant guilds were the predominant businessmen's organiza-

tions. The predecessor of the modern chamber of commerce was started during the reign of the French King, Henry, with the establishment of the Superior Chambers of Commerce of France. About that time, too, the merchants of Marseilles formed an independent voluntary group to represent the commercial interests of their port. This early local was closely akin to that country's present day chambers of commerce, voluntary organizations having quasi-public functions. Today these groups have charge of stock and produce exchanges, issue export certificates, and even help manage the port cities. They also differ from their American counterparts in that their membership is smaller, ranging from 9 to 21.

Switzerland has two distinct types—those that follow the French concept and function under state auspices, and independent groups similar to our own. The German chambers, like those in France, are pretty much official institutions. On the other hand, in Britain they are, like our own, entirely voluntary organizations.

And speaking of differences, our own chambers of commerce really evolved from three somewhat different types of business groups, each fulfilling a particular need created by a particular time and place. There were the trading organizations, whose members met for the sole purpose of trading with one another. These were sometimes known as boards of trade, a name that still survives in some areas, particularly small towns. Then there were the protective organizations—businessmen who banded together against high taxes and discriminatory regulations. And finally, in the newer sections of the country, town boosters organized to seek new industries and good roads that would draw tourist travel and help the community grow.

Regardless of these differences, the common goal of all three types of business groups was progress. But in a country marked by rapid growth and change as ours has been, what today may pass as progress can become, almost overnight, somewhat of a mixed blessing. For example, as the horse-and-buggy days slipped further into history, the big move to the new population centers brought new problems. But the old-timers saw no personal profit from becoming bigger cities, and they often voted down needed public improvement programs. Nevertheless the growth of America's cities was as inevitable as the industrial revolution, and so chambers of commerce became the vehicles by which civic-minded people could be mobilized "to build bigger communities by making them better."

The stock market crash brought a somewhat different problem, though. As land values went down, so did the municipality's ability to service their overextended bond capacity. Faced with high municipal taxes, the businessmen took a new look at their organization, and belatedly they became tax conscious. Today the role of guardian of the taxpayer's pocketbook is an established function of the chamber of commerce.

Until 1912, the chamber of commerce movement had little or no cohesiveness. Then President Taft urged a group of businessmen to form what later became the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Now there are 32 State and regional chambers, but the backbone of the movement still remains the local unit. And these days its business is not all business, either. The local chamber of commerce provides the leadership for all kinds of community activities—a project for the handicapped, the building of a playground, a fund drive to send city kids to camp.

As a matter of fact, projects aimed at helping youngsters rate high among chamber of commerce-sponsored activities. But then this preoccupation with the problems of America's children is nothing new in chamber of commerce history. The records show that the Ohio Chamber of Commerce—the oldest in the country—was responsible for the enactment of the first child labor law in the Nation.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Dutch Landing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1959, the second annual banquet of the Holland Society of New York, Potomac branch, was held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. This banquet marked the opening of the festivities commemorating the 350th anniversary of the landing of the Dutch at New Amsterdam.

I am particularly pleased to bring this significant occasion to the attention of my colleagues, as I am a life-long member of the Holland Society as was my father before me.

Messages were received at the banquet by numerous prominent persons, including His Excellency J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador to the United States, whose greeting read as follows:

Congratulations to the Potomac Branch of the Holland Society on initiating the 350th anniversary of the landing of our people on your shores and the commemoration of this year of history.

President Eisenhower wired greetings, as follows:

It is a pleasure to send greetings to the members and guests of the Potomac Branch of the Holland Society of New York gathered on the occasion of the 350th anniversary of the Dutch explorations by Henry Hudson. From the earliest days, the growth and spirit of our country have been strengthened by citizens of Dutch descent. The Holland Society helps to preserve an important quality of American culture. I am delighted to add my best wishes for a fine evening.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I should like to touch briefly on some of the historical highlights in connection with the settling of the Dutch on what is

now known as Manhattan. For instance, Netherlands' Prince Bernhard said, on May 19, 1958:

The Netherlands and the United States can pride themselves on very old cultural relations. In 1638 Holland provided your country with its first schoolmaster, Adam Roelants. An early President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, opened a long line of American students seeking knowledge at Dutch universities, when at the age of 13 he registered as a student at the University of Leyden.

You who are friends of my country and whose ancestors in many cases came from there, have set yourselves the task of advancing the friendship and cultural relations between our two countries.

There was a tablet in the court of the recently demolished Produce Exchange near the Customs House in downtown New York that marked the location of the first school in New Amsterdam, taught by Adam Roelandsen. It was also the first school of which there is any record in America.

Another first: In 1648, when the northernmost limits of the town extended no further than Wall Street, Gov. Pieter Stuyvesant laid the basic foundations of New York's and the Nation's volunteer fire-fighting system when he appointed four fire wardens.

A medical first in America: When the 17th century began, doctors cured much more by personality than by their remedies and practices. As a consequence, this era witnessed the discoveries of Antony van Leeuwenhoek, who built the microscope and was the first to describe the corpuscular formation of the blood, and those arising from Christian Huyghens' epochal studies in the field of optics. Dutch colonial America was the scene of several probable "firsts," notably the first coroner's inquest—1658—and establishment of the first hospital—1659.

The three Presidents: Three Presidents of the United States have been of direct descent in the male line from settlers of New Netherland well in advance of 1675. At least as many more occupants of the White House have been in part of such ancient stock through marriage. These three Presidents were also Governors of the State of New York. The first of the trio was Martin Van Buren, the second was Theodore Roosevelt—a very active member of the Holland Society—and the third was Franklin Delano Roosevelt, my father.

Our flag: The *Andria Doria*, bearing a copy of the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, and her commission from the Continental Congress, signed by John Hancock, with copies in blank, signed by the same, for the equipment of privateers, and with a 13-striped flag flying at her masthead, sailed into the roadstead of St. Eustatius on the 16th of November 1776. She dropped anchor before Orangetown and in front of Fort Orange. The commander of the fort, Abraham Ravenle, on seeing the character of the vessel, and recognizing the flag of the American Congress, was in a quandary.

What should he do? Should he salute it with the full number of "honor shots" which were usually accorded to men-of-war of a recognized nation and thus offi-

cially recognize sovereignty of the United States of America? He was ordered by Governor De Graeff to return the salute with two guns less, as if the *Andria Doria* were a merchantman. Upon the commander's return to the fort, the Dutch garrison belched forth a salute of 11 guns. Following this event were serious repercussions. Governor De Graeff was subsequently recalled to Holland. The English protested in no uncertain terms to the Netherlands Government and accused it of violating its neutrality in recognizing an enemy.

EVACUATION DAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1783

Their discovery is a feat even more difficult than that performed by Symon's great-grandson, Sgt. John van Arsdale, who, after fighting against the British in the War of the American Revolution and being captured, imprisoned, and nearly starved to death by them, on evacuation day at New York, November 25, 1783, climbed the tall greased flagpole at the battery, tore down the British flag, and fastened the American flag there. The British had evacuated the city at noon, leaving their flag flying, after secretly greasing the pole. American military orders for the day were that the American flag should be raised upon the pole when General Washington appeared at the battery. At the vital moment the order could not be executed; the humiliation was intense; no one was able to climb the pole—until a young man in the crowd of spectators volunteered. He was John van Arsdale, who, having been a sailor in his father's ship, climbed the pole, tore down the flag, and substituted Old Glory. Upon descending, he received an ovation and a gift of money, to which General Washington contributed. (Hoppin, "The Washington Ancestry," vol. III, p. 164.)

Many fortunes have been made in New York City real estate since the Indians traded Manhattan to Peter Minuit for trinkets worth \$24.

Today's value of all land and buildings, less tax-exempt holdings, on Manhattan Island is far in excess of \$10 billion. The Dutch certainly got a bargain for their beads.

National Allergy Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the month beginning August 15 and ending September 15 as National Allergy Month. Its purpose is to urge the people of this Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of allergic illness and to invite the communities of the United States to mobilize and extend their health resources to more adequately take care of the growing number of our citizens afflicted with these diseases.

The allergic diseases include both common and rare conditions. Some are so serious as to threaten life, others are

no more than annoyances. But, all impair health, happiness, and productivity and many decrease longevity. While most of us are familiar, at least by the name, with bronchial asthma, hay fever, allergic eczema, allergic headaches, abnormal reactions to drugs, and the contact skin eruptions so common in industry, we are less familiar with the diseases of an allergic nature which affect the heart and circulatory system, the blood cells, the gastrointestinal tract, the kidneys, and nervous system. Among the important systemic diseases suspected of having an allergic basis are rheumatic fever, ulcerative colitis, certain types of nephritis, and that group of conditions which are known collectively as the collagen diseases.

The allergic diseases are a leading cause of acute disease and chronic disability among individuals in every decade of life, but especially among children since the initial symptoms of allergy appear more often in the first two decades of life than at any other time. Allergic diseases are also among the leading causes of death among children.

Long neglected because they do not have the reputation of being killers, the allergic diseases are now recognized as major causes of disability, invalidism, and absenteeism from school, business, and industry. It is conservatively estimated that a minimum of 17 million Americans suffer during their lives from an allergic disease, ranging from annoying hay fever to severe, crippling and often incapacitating asthma. Minor allergic episodes, such as isolated attacks of poison ivy dermatitis, affect more than half our total population at one time or another.

The two most common distinct allergic diseases are asthma and hay fever. So far as our civilian population is concerned, the U.S. Public Health Service ranks hay fever and asthma third in prevalence among the chronic diseases—following diseases of the heart and circulation and arthritis and rheumatism. Together, asthma and hay fever account for more than 25 million work-days lost each year.

ALLERGY IN CHILDREN

The overall incidence of allergies in children is about 14 percent. In a study of 1,225 children, aged 1 to 14 years, chosen at random from a general population, no fewer than 175 children were diagnosed as definitely allergic and 220 as probably allergic. Multiple allergies were found to occur in slightly more than 3 out of 4 allergic children. Three-quarters of the patients with eczema had respiratory allergies and/or asthma.

Food allergy, especially that to cow's milk, causing gastrointestinal symptoms and infantile eczema is the most common type of allergy in early infancy. In children, respiratory allergies are the most troublesome disorders. In this group, food allergy is somewhat replaced by sensitivity to pollens, animal danders and hair, and bacterial infection. Studies show that more than 50 percent of children with eczema develop asthma. More than 40 percent with respiratory allergies eventually develop bronchial asthma.

Prophylaxis and treatment of major allergies in early childhood may not only prevent asthma and hay fever but also reduce the frequency of recurring upper respiratory infections.

Patients under 20 have a much better prospect of obtaining marked relief from most types of allergy than do older people. Early diagnosis and competent allergic, medical, dermatologic, and sometimes psychiatric management can prevent both the troublesome complications that arise from long-standing allergy and some of the secondary changes that produce recurring disability.

ASTHMA

While asthma may begin at any age, the majority of cases begin in childhood. If neglected, the disease tends to recur and become chronic so that it may lead to serious, disabling pulmonary disease in adult life. Infants with eczema and children with hay fever are apt to develop asthma. The popular belief that the asthmatic child will outgrow his condition is a dangerous one. If the asthma is neglected, it tends to persist. Even if it does subside spontaneously, it may leave its victim handicapped physically and psychologically.

Asthma is one of the more frequent causes of referral to pediatric outpatient clinics and children's hospital wards each year. It has been stated that the odds are 8 or 9 to 1 that a child with asthma will grow out of it. Unhappily, without the assistance of early preventive measures, many asthmatic children develop severe complications difficult to treat.

Perhaps the most common complication of asthma is emphysema, or overdistention of the lungs. The lungs become voluminous; they have very little mobility. Oxygenation of the blood is impaired. The patient becomes short of breath on even light exertion and sometimes even at rest.

There is extra risk for asthmatics from surgical procedures. Medico-actuarial studies consistently show that a great part of the excess mortality among asthmatic persons is due to high death rates from respiratory complications of the disease itself and from pneumonia, heart disease, and tuberculosis. Insurance experiences would indicate that asthmatic victims are relatively less resistant to diseases involving the respiratory system than are nonasthmatics. Insurance studies indicate that the mortality rate for patients with asthma, taken as a group, is appreciably greater than for nonasthmatics and consequently their average length of life is somewhat less. The presence of asthma in an individual is not compatible with a high level of general health and efficiency.

ALLERGY IN INDUSTRY: OCCUPATIONAL ALLERGIES

In our system of free enterprise, the unimpaired health of the worker is essential to the continued growth and expansion of the national productive effort and so, to the Nation's welfare. Our national productive capacity is reduced, not only by the great killing diseases of man, but also by conditions which sap our national vitality through insidious

inroads on the health of the worker, be he an executive, a craftsman, or a laborer. The allergic diseases are among the chronic conditions which lead to substandard work performance, excessive absenteeism, and a continuous demand for medical attention.

The allergic diseases reduce longevity. They kill many individuals prematurely and contribute to other deaths by predisposing to heart and lung disease. But their importance lies in the toll they exact from our working population, day by day and year after year. Where allergic conditions arise from occupational exposures, an increasingly frequent situation in this age of chemicals and synthetic products, compensation awards add to the financial losses.

The incidence of allergy among the general population exceeds 10 percent. It is double this in many industries where workers are exposed to allergens by contact or inhalation. At least 20 percent of occupational conditions are allergic, and these are largely conditions which recur again and again.

Industrial progress has intensified the problem of allergy. There is widespread evidence of sensitization to industrial chemical agents, including the constantly increasing number of new compounds used in our modern technology.

Allergic contact skin disease is one of the most common diseases in industry today. It is frequently seen, for example, among workers who handle dyes and dye intermediates, photographic developers, rubber accelerators and antioxidants, soaps, mercury solutions, plants and plant derivatives, insecticides, plastics, and antibiotics.

DRUG SENSITIVITY

Allergic reactions are provoked in sensitive individuals by many of the drugs commonly used in medical treatment, including such well-known drugs as aspirin, quinine, arsenic, the barbiturates, the bromides and iodides, and sulfa drugs. Biological products such as insulin, liver extract, other hormones, and serums, also may produce allergic reactions. The numbers of persons affected year by year is in the thousands. While many such reactions are mild and are terminated by the withdrawal of the drug, others are extremely serious and even fatal.

The problem of drug sensitivity has become increasingly important during recent years since the multiplication of new compounds used in medical treatment has led to a proportionate increase in the number of drug reactions. Among the most common offenders today are the antibiotics.

Allergic reactions to the antibiotics have increased in proportion to the extended use of these agents. Penicillin is particularly apt to produce allergic reactions and, because penicillin is the most commonly used antibiotic, reactions to it have been reported in great numbers. A survey made in 1956 revealed the thousands of reactions to penicillin annually, with deaths numbering in the hundreds.

While the antibiotics have saved thousands of lives and reduced the

length and severity of infections in millions of people, allergic reactions are sufficiently frequent and serious as to pose an important medical problem.

THE ALLERGY PROBLEM TODAY

At present, large sums are being expended for research in infantile paralysis, tuberculosis, rheumatism and heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, prematurity and so forth. Allergy affects as many children as do any one of these, yet there is practically no money being expended on its study. The reason for this is that death seldom results from an allergy despite its incapacitating and chronic character.

Despite the amount of disability they cause, the allergic diseases have received relatively little attention in the development of specialized facilities for treatment, in research and in medical education. Even in cities with the best of general hospitals, it is often difficult or impossible for the asthmatic patient of modest means to obtain adequate care. Severe asthma requires the most intensive medical and nursing service, yet may persist far longer than the acute stage of most other diseases. As a result, hospitals treating acute diseases are often reluctant to admit such patients and institutions offering chronic care are poorly equipped to handle them.

The number of allergy patients seen in outpatient clinics of hospitals and in the offices of physicians is sufficiently striking, but even more so is the number of patient visits. Statistics provided by the United Hospital Fund of New York City reveal that allergy sufferers require on an average three times as many clinic or office visits per year than do those suffering from all other types of illness.

What is being done to help the millions of Americans suffering from allergic diseases? The Allergy Foundation of America, a voluntary health agency established under the sponsorship of the two national professional societies, the American Academy of Allergy and the American College of Allergists, has developed a broad program of public information and education intended to guide the allergic individual in obtaining the best possible medical care. This agency attempts to bring to the public reliable information on the latest scientific knowledge about allergy, and the management and treatment of the allergic diseases.

In order to accelerate efforts in the field of allergy, the foundation complements the expanded program of research and training of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases by offering opportunities for specialized training for medical students, graduate physicians and research scientists in the form of scholarships, fellowships, and grants.

The Allergy Foundation of America initiated National Allergy Month 2 years ago with the purpose of disseminating as widely as possible information concerning allergy as a growing health problem. For each of the past 2 years the educational campaign conducted during this month has been highly successful and several hundred thousands of informational pamphlets have been

distributed to the public in an effort to inform and educate our citizens. The Allergy Foundation of America plans to sponsor a National Allergy Month again this year, August 15–September 15. To this end, the joint resolution which I have today introduced in conjunction with Senator LISTER HILL, will seek to obtain Presidential proclamation urging Americans to support this program through voluntary gifts and services in their communities.

A Good Neighbor: Senator Humphrey on Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, at the University of Florida on April 3 of this year the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, delivered a speech on Latin America.

It is exceptional. It is a brilliant résumé of the existing problems between the governments of Latin America and the Government of the United States.

The Senator has come to grips with the central issues involved without the clichés and generalities so prevalent in discussions of Latin America.

Under a previous consent, I am including the text of Senator HUMPHREY's statement in the RECORD.

A NEW ERA FOR LATIN AMERICA

(Address prepared for delivery by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., Friday night, April 3, 1959)

Tonight I might have selected as my topic the Berlin crisis, the troubled Middle East or the vexing problem of attempting to control the nuclear arms race. But I have chosen instead to talk about Latin America and U.S. policy toward her Latin American neighbors. Since the end of World War II we have been preoccupied with a series of crises on the periphery of the Communist empire—Greece, Berlin, Korea, Indochina, Suez, Quemoy, Lebanon, and again Berlin. In the meantime, the seemingly less precarious situation in Latin America went almost unnoticed.

It took the demonstrations against Vice President Nixon last spring to explode any remaining illusions about the state of our Latin American relations. The plain truth is that today inter-American relations are in a more critical stage than they have been at any time in the past three decades.

At this point, I would like to pause to pay tribute to the University of Florida, one of the few U.S. universities which has a well-rounded Latin American studies program. Recently, the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress surveyed universities across the country to find out which ones offered Latin American studies. I am told that only eight universities fall into category I, that is, ones which offer a well-staffed, well-rounded course of study about Latin America. The University of Florida is one of these eight. Florida's awareness of the importance of inter-American understanding also has been reflected in the

thoughtful and persistent efforts of Senator SMATHERS to bring attention to the realities of our foreign policy in Latin America.

We are now on the threshold of the 69th anniversary of the Organization of American States. It has long been customary at this time of the year to extol pan-American peace, solidarity, and cooperation. Such oratory now would be a gratuitous gesture. It is dangerous to perpetuate comfortable fictions about a bond that has been broken. The first prerequisite of a responsible and effective policy toward Latin America is a willingness to face the facts, however unpleasant they may be.

OUR STAKE IN LATIN AMERICA

There is no disagreement on the importance of cordial, cooperative relations with our 20 sister Republics. Everyone agrees that strategically, ICBM's notwithstanding, Latin America remains one of the key foundations of our defense shield. Politically, close and harmonious relations with the Latin American people, who now number over 180 million, add to the free world's strength in the larger issues of the cold war.

Economically, the American Republics constitute a vital ingredient in our own well-being. The area is second only to Europe as a purchaser of our exports. Twenty-five percent of all our exports go there. In 1957 this meant the sale of \$560 million worth of automobiles and parts, of \$445 million worth of chemicals, \$135 million of medicines, \$121 million of edible animal products, and so on across the board of U.S. products. Latin American purchases add up to a lot of jobs for a lot of people in the United States. At the same time, imports from south of the Rio Grande consist of many strategic minerals as well as materials essential to our peacetime industries. U.S. private investments in the area now total over \$9 billion, more than in any other region of the world.

Why, then, have relations deteriorated?

CRISIS POLICY

Part of the responsibility lies in our preoccupation with Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. While attention to these vital areas is understandable, the resulting neglect of Latin America cannot be justified. The personal diplomacy of the administration has also tended in the same direction. With all decisionmaking power concentrated in Secretary Dulles, the less precarious situation in Latin America got shoved into the background until it too became a crisis. Up until the recent disturbances, I am told, Foreign Service officers working in Latin America were somehow considered to be occupying second-class positions.

TAKING LATIN AMERICA FOR GRANTED

The good-neighbor policy itself may be partly to blame for the assumption that nothing much could go wrong within our hemisphere. Latin American representatives tried to make their grievances heard through proper channels and at stated conferences. Often their warnings and protests were bitter. But the good-neighbor policy had been so successful in cementing United States-Latin American relations that long after its demise an aura of good will lingered on, hiding the grim realities underneath. The hangover from the good-neighbor policy seems to have created an impression in the United States that the Latin American republics were solidly with us, no matter what we did or did not do.

LATIN-AMERICAN REVOLUTIONS

The attitude of taking Latin America for granted is only part of the growing estrangement between the United States and Latin America. I think that our gravest error has been a misreading of the revolution gripping the region. Some people are prone to dis-

miss Latin American revolts as mere changes in the palace guard, while others see Communist influence in every upheaval. These stereotypes can be our undoing.

Today, the nations to the south are in the midst of an epic social revolution. We and the Communists have vied with each other in telling people the world over that they no longer have to live out their lives in hopeless misery. The peoples of Latin America took us at our word.

They want an end to semifeudal conditions in which 5 percent of the population owns 80 to 90 percent of the land; in which a handful of nationals and foreigners live in luxury while the majority live in squalor; in which disease strikes down their children, and hunger and ignorance perpetuate their slavery; in which the wealthy minority joins with the army to keep things just as they are.

Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile, imprisonment, torture, and death to achieve responsible governments, responsive to the needs of their people. These courageous people usually come from the classes that produce political leadership—students, union leaders, professional and business men. The rash of revolutions that toppled tyrannies in Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, and Cuba attests to their determination to achieve freedom and bread.

THE LATIN AMERICAN IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

In the midst of that upheaval, which we above all other peoples should be able to understand and to sympathize with, the United States has somehow managed to appear callous and indifferent. While we have eagerly sought Latin American support to stop the spread of Communist tyranny, we have demonstrated a peculiar nonchalance toward despotisms of the home-grown variety.

In 1954 Secretary Dulles took time to fly to the ninth Inter-American Conference in Caracas to press for an inter-American declaration against Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere. That very same year we bestowed the Legion of Merit on Pérez Jiménez then the hated dictator of Venezuela. The incredible citation reads in part:

"To H. E. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, President of the Republic of Venezuela for the exceptional nature of his outstanding accomplishments. His Excellency, as President of the Republic of Venezuela and previously, has demonstrated a spirit of friendship and cooperation with the United States. The sound economic, financial, and foreign investment policies advocated and pursued by his administration have contributed greatly to the economic well-being of his country, and to the rapid development of its tremendous resources. These policies, judiciously combined with a far reaching public works program, have remarkably improved its education, sanitation, transportation, housing, and other important basic facilities."

Shortly after our tribute to Pérez Jiménez, the Archbishop of Caracas dared to denounce the tyrant in a pastoral letter, and thousands of anguished Venezuelans hazarded their lives to get rid of the bloody oppressor upon whom we had lavished praise.

On January 10, 1958—just 13 days before unarmed men, women, and children rose heroically against the brutal Venezuelan dictatorship—the man who had been our Ambassador to Venezuela from 1951 to 1956 wrote from his new post in Turkey to the dictator's savage secret-police chief congratulating him for putting down the first abortive revolt. The letter, on Foreign Service stationery, came to light after the democratic revolution.

These incidents are, unfortunately, not isolated. Our Defense Department, in the middle of the Cuban revolt, decorated the officer who had commanded air raids against

the Cuban people. We kept up a stream of armaments to Batista long after it had become apparent that he was using them against his own people, contrary to the terms of our defense agreement.

The Communists, of course, are getting a lot of mileage out of such errors. But we must face up to the fact that our own actions, not Communist propaganda, have created throughout Latin America an image of the United States as a nation selfishly engrossed in defending its own freedoms but heedless of the aspirations of others.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IS SERIOUS

U.S. official attitudes with regard to Latin America's economic problems have deepened the estrangement between us.

Our economic attitudes toward Latin America have created the image of the United States as arrogant, paternal, interested primarily in promoting the interests of U.S. investors, and unconcerned for the well-being of ordinary human beings. It is painful to think that the generous impulse of the United States, which first created the idea of technical assistance in Latin America in 1942, now seems so perverted.

As you know, all the American Republics, to a greater or less degree, fall into the category of underdeveloped countries. All are dependent on the export of one, or at best a few, commodities to earn the foreign exchange to buy vital necessities and to finance economic development.

Any downswing in the world price or demand for their few exports plays havoc with their income. This uncertainty makes development planning exceedingly difficult.

With an average annual per capita income of less than \$300, some areas in Latin America are hard pressed to maintain even this low living standard in the face of a rapidly growing population.

Our neighbors have not been sitting on their hands waiting for assistance. Ninety percent of the capital invested in the area is Latin America's own. The reserves accumulated from the sale of raw materials during World War II, made possible a spurt of development in the region. From 1945 to 1953 the average per capita income rose at the rate of 3.3 percent a year, and Mexico, for example, achieved a rate twice as great. After 1952, with reserves depleted and the price and demand for Latin America's principal products on the decline, the accelerated rate of development ground to a halt.

Responsible leaders in Latin America are worried. On the one hand they have populations awakened from centuries of apathy who are demanding a better deal in life. On the other hand, the ubiquitous Communists are there, dangling tempting promises before the eyes of the underprivileged. Democratic leaders in Latin America know that they must produce some tangible results, that they must provide some hope for a better future, if democratic government is to endure.

THE U.S. RESPONSE HAS BEEN AMBIGUOUS

On the question of Latin America's economic development the United States has presented an ambiguous picture. Latin Americans understood and welcomed Secretary Marshall's stirring declaration at Harvard University 12 years ago: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." Hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos well described Latin American conditions. And, we encouraged the Latin Americans to look almost exclusively to us for assistance.

We then proceeded to provide billions in aid to Europe and Asia. To Latin American pleas for assistance, we replied with advice that they should look to private investments and private enterprise as the principal channel for their funds. In 1956 Senator SMATHERS proposed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to provide a special

fund for loans for Latin America for health, education and sanitation projects. This proposal met with resistance from the State Department on the grounds that private capital was doing a good enough job. I am happy to say that Congress passed the amendment in spite of State Department resistance.

The frequent reiteration that private capital would meet Latin American requirements insulted and irritated our neighbors. We Americans like our system of free enterprise. It has worked for us, although not in the simon-pure form that some people like to pretend. Latin Americans, on the other hand, have some sour memories of the robber-baron type investments, both domestic and foreign, which we ourselves have long since ceased to tolerate.

In addition to historical differences, the advice ignored the plain fact that private enterprise goes in to make a profit, and will hardly be attracted when the basic sinews of a national economy—such as roads, power and sanitation facilities—are lacking.

Moreover, overdependence on private investment results in a piecemeal approach to economic development as private funds haphazardly move into a mine here and a factory there. Latin Americans point out that in their urgent circumstances they cannot wait for the trickle-down theory to maybe work.

THE U.S. CHANGE OF HEART

It took the violent outbursts against Vice President Nixon to make us conscious of the gravity of the Latin American situation. On March 10 last the Department of State announced a change of heart, as follows:

"Not only must account be taken of the private capital and technical know-how required to create employment for those who today are underemployed or unemployed, but also of the need to create new jobs for an even larger number of workers. In addition to the expansion of industry and agriculture which this implies, very large additional amounts of public funds will be required for facilities which only governments can provide; for example, highways, sanitation facilities, hospitals, and schools."

The recognition that Latin American growing pains differ from ours and our consequent abandonment of inflexible doctrinaire principles should open the way for better inter-American understanding.

Along the new guidelines positive steps are in progress. The administration has finally announced that it will support an Inter-American Development Bank, something the Latin Americans have been urging for years and we have been resisting for years. We have agreed to consult with the Republics before making decisions which could affect their principal exports. We have indicated a willingness to take a fresh look at efforts to deal with instability and fluctuation in the commodity market. We have lent our support to the idea of regional markets within Latin America.

In short, we have recognized the magnitude of Latin America's problem and have agreed to cooperate with our neighbors in finding solutions.

A NINE-POINT PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Latin America, as population zooms, as industrial development spreads, and hope and impatience mingle, is going to be a cauldron of competing political ideologies. We should welcome this development, not fear it.

In no region of the world have we deeper historical traditions to build upon. It was with the Latin American Republics that we first developed the idea of regional cooperation. The bold idea of mutual cooperation to attack disease, illiteracy, and poverty was born within the inter-American family.

These are the people who wept unashamedly when Franklin Delano Roosevelt died.

Today in Latin America there are many leaders who understand and admire our democratic system and want to develop something comparable in their own countries. I know of an American who, while attending the inauguration last month of the democratically elected President of Venezuela, was asked on three separate occasions by newly elected Venezuelan congressmen how they could get hold of a copy of the "Jefferson Manual of Rules for the House of Representatives."

Our traditions of individual freedom and concern for ordinary human beings were once the cornerstone of our successful Latin American policy. Now, to Latin Americans, these much admired beliefs seem to stop at the border. While we caution our neighbors about Communist activities and Communist infiltration, we appear peculiarly cold toward the Latin American yearning to achieve genuine civil liberties.

The recent steps taken by the administration to repair our tottering Latin American policy should be applauded. They are steps in the right direction, but they will not be enough if the escalator of history is going faster in the opposite direction. We must replace our massive indifference to Latin American aspirations with massive cooperation.

The Latin American situation cries out for imaginative, long-range planning, rather than the hurried, patch-up measures after an explosion has occurred.

A coordinated program on the order of the Marshall plan would give the Latin Americans new hope of attaining bread and freedom. The possibilities of such an effort should be explored carefully, not primarily as an anti-Communist stratagem, but because it is good for Latin America and for the United States. We should not be ashamed of our humanitarian tradition. Nor should we be embarrassed if humanitarian and security objectives sometimes coincide in our national policy.

In conclusion, I should like to propose a nine-point program for improving United States-Latin American relations. I believe this program is realistic and workable and in harmony with the best interests of our country and of our 20 sister Republics.

First. The United States should increase the volume of its economic aid in support of Latin American efforts to develop diversified and viable economies so they will not be dependent, as they now are, on a few commodities. Requests for loans from the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank should be dealt with expeditiously and sympathetically. We should cooperate fully with the new Inter-American Development Institution. The proposed corps of technical experts within the institute could help the smaller, inexperienced countries draw up coordinated development plans.

Second. The United States should accelerate and strengthen its program of technical assistance in agriculture, health, education, vocational training, and public administration. The time has come to recapture the original fervor of President Truman's bold new program which was widely hailed in Latin America when it was first announced a decade ago.

Third. The United States should support vigorously the current moves within Latin America to establish regional markets. The elimination of inter-American trade barriers would broaden markets for Latin American products and make low-cost manufacturing feasible, both indispensable prerequisites to diversification and economic growth.

Fourth. The United States should review its trade and tariff policies as they affect imports from Latin America. It is self-defeat-

ing for us to provide economic assistance with one hand and take it away with the other by shortsighted trade restrictions. If policies designed to strengthen our trade with Latin America cause hardship to any domestic industry, the Government has a responsibility to aid those so affected. (I recently cosponsored an amendment in the Senate to the Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722) to make such aid possible, but unfortunately it did not pass the committee stage.)

Fifth. The United States should give wholehearted support to the health programs under the direction of the Pan American Sanitary Organization. Widespread disease which stalks Latin America is a tremendous economic drain as well as a human tragedy. Investment in health is perhaps the cheapest, most effective investment we can make in the future of the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. The United States should develop a bold and imaginative program of student and cultural exchange.

We need to reexamine our methods of screening Latin American scholarship recipients. Too frequently the test has been the friendliness of the recipient toward the United States. Young Latin Americans of so-called leftist tendencies have been excluded, when they are often the very ones who would benefit most from the program.

Seventh. The U.S. press, radio, and TV, networks should give wider and better balanced news coverage of Latin American affairs. This, of course, is something our Government can do little about. But it is essential that the American people have a continuous report and interpretation of Latin American developments if they are to understand the magnitude of the problems in that region and what we are asked to support. When news of revolutions and executions dominate our newspapers, it is hard for the American taxpayer to form an understanding of the underlying realities in the 20 American Republics, and of our interest in them.

Eighth. The United States should thoroughly reappraise its military assistance program in Latin America. What we have given one nation for hemispheric defense has often provoked demands by another for an equal amount of aid. Great care should be taken not to encourage this type of arms race, which Latin American governments can ill-afford. We should give greater attention to the coordination of military policy and strategy in the hemisphere. This might well result in a decrease in the requirements of national military establishments.

Further, our military assistance to certain dictatorial governments has raised the question of whose freedom those governments are defending. The use by Batista of U.S. supplied armaments against his own people, contrary to stipulations of our defense treaty, has greatly damaged U.S. prestige throughout Latin America. It makes little sense to speak of hemisphere defense while arming a tyrant who uses weapons to intimidate his own people.

Ninth. The United States should lend its support to the idea of regional arms control. Last year Costa Rica submitted such a plan to the Organization of American States and received nominal support from the U.S. delegation. Our Government should now press for the consideration of the Costa Rican plan or some similar project, at the eleventh inter-American Conference to be held at Quito next year.

The quality of our overall policy toward Latin America will be determined not only by what we do, but by how we do it.

Unless we pursue our policies with a genuine interest in the welfare of our fellow human beings, they will do little to heal our wounded inter-American relations. The steps already taken by the Department of

State, many of them complete reversals of former policy, will avail us little if they are done reluctantly and only under Latin American pressure.

We must, if we are to recapture the warm bonds of friendship which characterized the best days of the good-neighbor policy, breathe into inter-American cooperation that intangible spirit which then characterized our relations—a deep-rooted conviction that the Western Hemisphere can, indeed it must, be a New World where freedom and opportunity flourish.

Statement Upon Introduction of Legislation Proposing Constitutional Amendment To Assure the States Exclusive Control Over the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in a bill which I am introducing today, I am proposing an amendment to the Constitution which shall be valid upon ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. This amendment reads:

Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution, or system is administered by such State and subdivision.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] previously has introduced similar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court in its 1954 desegregation decision decreed that the separate but equal principle in providing public education was unconstitutional, there was set in motion pressure which has caused turmoil in the South and in other sections of this country.

Since this unprecedented decision was handed down, we have seen radical elements flourish, schools destroyed by explosives, Federal troops with bayonets invading a campus, and public school buildings shut down. Today, nearly 5 years later, the issue is more irreconcilable than ever. The problem remains, and it is time a solution is found.

In my estimation, the solution can be approached only when a sound constitutional foundation is laid. This is what the amendment which I propose seeks to provide.

For some time, I have insisted that education is and ought to be under exclusive control of State and local authorities. There should be no room under our Constitution for the Federal Government to usurp this authority, and that is what happened in the 1954 integration decree.

History warns us of the usurpation of powers by the judiciary. George Washington in his Farewell Address stated:

Let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

In 1956, a special committee of outstanding jurists appointed by the Governor of Florida made a thorough study of public-school education in the light of the Supreme Court decisions. The committee pointed out that the assumption of power to change the meaning of the Constitution such as evidenced by the Supreme Court's integration decrees is an abuse of public trust and a tyrannical usurpation of power. The committee pointed out:

The Constitution of the United States may be amended only in the manner provided in

that Constitution. In the course of history since the adoption of the Constitution the people have 21 times found it expedient to amend the Constitution, and when that unanimity of public opinion which justifies a change in the Constitution has developed among the people they have found no difficulty in effecting the changes they found desirable.

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the time has come and the people are ready for a constitutional amendment to assure each State the right to determine how it will conduct its public-school system.

David Lawrence, noted and respected syndicated columnist and publisher, recently in his column pointed to what seems to me to be the growing unworkability of integration in the schools. He indicates that the issue may reach the status of prohibition and its repeal, where the collateral effects of the controversy made it clear that each State

should have the right to control its own liquor traffic. Mr. Lawrence concludes:

So with respect to school integration—as already revealed in the big cities of the North, including voteless Washington—the emergence of emotional issues having little to do with the merits of education or equality of status of individuals may finally decide the controversy in the next decade. It could bring a wave of feeling that local option—the right of each State to handle its own educational problems—is again the answer to a question of sociology as raised by the Supreme Court.

These emotional side-effects, which are already splitting this Nation, should not be allowed to grow. Let us take the problem out of the hands of a judicial oligarchy and place it back in the hands of the people concerned. The people can and will solve this problem to their own satisfaction if given the opportunity. An amendment to the Constitution, such as I propose, would, I sincerely believe, give them that opportunity.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1959

Rev. William C. Martin, bishop of the Dallas-Fort Worth area of the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who art the source of all truth and of all righteousness, we give Thee grateful thanks for the abundance of Thy mercies by which our Nation was brought to birth and by which it has been guided and guarded and sustained, even unto this day. Grant, we beseech Thee, to Thy servants, the President and the Members of the Senate, such a full measure of Thy wisdom that they may be able to interpret, wisely and faithfully, Thy will for the people whom they represent and for this Nation and the nations of the world. And may the decisions which they make this day and every day be so fully in accord with the principles of justice and freedom that the people will be guided aright and the peace and welfare of the world advanced, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 13, 1959, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT—MINORITY, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—(S. REPT. 187)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1959,

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on April 14, 1959, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain

financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, together with minority, supplemental, and individual views, which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) extending greetings to the Honorable Harry S. Truman on the 75th anniversary of his birth, May 8, 1959.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills

and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 836. An act to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1844. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended by the acts of July 2, 1940, and July 12, 1950;

H.R. 5534. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near 14th Street in the District of Columbia, under the act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4601. An act to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize the appropriation of \$500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the III pan-American games to be held in Chicago, Ill.; and

H.R. 3648. An act to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 836. An act to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries,